REMARKS

Claims 1-32 have been allowed. Claims 62, 68 and 69 have been amended. Claims 43, 45, 56, 58, 61 and 64-67 have been canceled. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-32, 62, 68 and 69 are pending.

Disclaimers Relating to Claim Interpretation and Prosecution History Estoppel

Claims 43, 45, 56, 58, 61 and 64-67 have been canceled, notwithstanding the belief that these claims were allowable. Claims 62, 68 and 69 have been amended solely for the purpose of expediting the patent application process, and the amendments were not necessary for patentability.

The claims of this application are intended to stand on their own and are not to be read in light of the prosecution history of any related or unrelated patent or patent application. Furthermore, no arguments in any prosecution history relate to any claim in this application, except for arguments specifically directed to the claim.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 62, 68 and 69 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Per the Examiner's recommendation, claims 62, 68 and 69 have been amended to be independent and include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, the objection has been overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 43, 45, 56 and 58 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious from Brickley (USP 5,902,552) in view of either Bigelow (USP 6,221,314) or Hollander (USP 5,334,347). Claims 43, 45, 56 and 58 have been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claims 61 and 64-67 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious from Brickley in view of Hollander and Kurtz et al. (USP 5,660,719). Claims 61 and 64-67 have been canceled.

Appl. No. 10/706,483 Amdt. Dated 11/27/2006

Response to Office action dated 08/03/2006

Conclusion

It is submitted, however, that the independent and dependent claims include other significant and substantial recitations which are not disclosed in the cited references. Thus, the claims are also patentable for additional reasons. However, for economy the additional grounds for patentability are not set forth here.

In view of all of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested and allowance at an early date is solicited.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned registered practitioner to answer any questions or to discuss steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 27, 2006

Joel G. Landau, Reg. No. 54,732

Jed S. Lale-

SoCal IP Law Group LLP 310 N. Westlake Blvd., Suite 120 Westlake Village, CA 91362 Telephone: 805/230-1350

Facsimile: 805/230-1355 email: info@socalip.com